

ULB-PMIF/93-02

Ghosts of ghosts for second class constraints

Marc Henneaux

Faculté des Sciences, Université Libre de Bruxelles,
Campus Plaine C.P. 231, B-1050 Bruxelles, Belgium

and

Centro de Estudios Científicos de Santiago,
Casilla 16443, Santiago 9, Chile

Abstract

When one uses the Dirac bracket, second class constraints become first class. Hence, they are amenable to the BRST treatment characteristic of ordinary first class constraints. This observation is the starting point of a recent investigation by Batalin and Tyutin, in which all the constraints are put on the same footing. However, because second class constraints identically vanish as operators in the quantum theory, they are quantum-mechanically reducible and require therefore ghosts of ghosts. Otherwise, the BRST cohomology would not yield the correct physical spectrum. We discuss how to incorporate this feature in the formalism and show that it leads to an infinite tower of ghosts of ghosts. An alternative treatment, in which the brackets of the ghosts are modified, is also mentioned.

Constraints in constrained Hamiltonian systems can arise for different physical reasons [1]. They may originate from a gauge invariance of the theory, in which case they are first class. Or they may indicate that the $q - p$ commutation rules must be modified, in which case they are second class. First class constraints kill twice as many degrees of freedom as second class constraints do. Geometrically, first class constraints define co-isotropic submanifolds, while second class constraints define regular submanifolds (i.e. submanifolds with an invertible induced two-form - for a recent review, see [2]).

The standard quantization rules implement first class and second class constraints quite differently. This is natural in view of the different physical meanings of the constraints. However, this feature is somewhat unfortunate because it requires an explicit separation of the constraints into first and second classes before going to the quantum theory. This is always possible in principle, but in practice, the split may be cumbersome or may spoil manifest Lorentz invariance. For this reason, various efforts have been devoted to the question of quantizing the constraints in a more uniform manner.

Recently, Batalin and Tyutin have constructed a very interesting algebraic scheme in which the constraints are formally kept on the same footing [3, 4, 5]. Their starting point is the observation that all the constraints are first class if one uses the Dirac bracket. Hence, one may define a BRST generator in which one associates a conjugate pair of ghosts to all (first *and* second class) constraints. In that approach, the ghost spectrum appears to make no distinction between the constraints. Batalin and Tyutin then go on to develop a powerful formalism that incorporates the covariance properties of the Dirac bracket under redefinitions of the constraints, but this analysis will not be needed for our discussion, which focuses on a much more elementary point. *We shall only investigate here the extent to which one can introduce a ghost spectrum uniformly for all the constraints.* The main result of this letter is to indicate that the ghost spectrum must be augmented by ghosts of ghosts for the second class constraints. These ghosts of ghosts destroy the symmetry between first class and second class constraints. A uniform treatment may be recovered if one introduces further an infinite tower of additional ghosts of ghosts.

Let z^A ($A = 1, \dots, n$) be the phase space coordinates and let $\phi_a(z^A)$ ($a = 1, \dots, m$) be the constraint functions. We assume the constraints to be irreducible for simplicity. We denote the Dirac bracket by $[\cdot, \cdot]$ and will

make no mention of the original Poisson bracket thereafter. One important feature of the Dirac bracket is that it is degenerate in the algebra $C^\infty(P)$ of smooth phase space functions $f(z^A)$. Indeed, if χ_α are the second class constraints that have been used in the definition of the Dirac bracket, then one has

$$[f, \chi_\alpha] = 0. \quad (1)$$

It is the degeneracy of the Dirac bracket that enables one to distinguish between first class and second class constraints when one has eliminated the Poisson bracket. Although degenerate in the algebra $C^\infty(P)$ of smooth functions defined in the entire phase space, the Dirac bracket is regular in the algebra $C^\infty(\Sigma_2)$ of functions defined on the surface of the second class constraints. But since we want to maintain a symmetric treatment of the constraints, we do not reduce the system to Σ_2 at this stage and work instead with the full algebra $C^\infty(P)$.

In terms of the Dirac bracket, all the constraints are first class

$$[\phi_a, \phi_b] = C_{ab}^c \phi_c \quad (2)$$

and we shall denote by $\Omega(z^A, \eta^a, \mathcal{P}_a)$ the corresponding BRST generator¹. There is one pair of conjugate ghosts $(\eta^a, \mathcal{P}_a)$ for each constraint ϕ_a . The BRST generator fulfills

$$[\Omega, \Omega] = 0 \quad (3)$$

(in the Dirac bracket) everywhere in phase space and not just on the surface of the second class constraints. The fact that the Dirac bracket is degenerate does not prevent one from obtaining the BRST generator in the usual manner. The Koszul-Tate differential used in the standard construction explained in [2] is acyclic at positive resolution degree independently of what the bracket is, and the first class property (2) guarantees that one can complete the $\phi_a \eta^a$ -term in

$$\Omega = \phi_a \eta^a + \dots \quad (4)$$

¹It is denoted by Ω_0 in [3]. Note that once the solution of (3) is found, the general solution of the equations of [3, 4] reads, in the notations of [3, 4],

$$\Omega_0 + \Gamma_A^* (\Gamma^A + O(\eta^a)) + O(\Gamma_A^* J \Gamma_B^*)$$

(and Δ is defined by Eq. (3.5) of [4]). Thus, one may say that the heart of the construction of [3, 4] is contained in the equation $[\Omega_0, \Omega_0] = 0$.

in the usual recursive procedure, in such a way that (3) holds.

However, the degeneracy of the bracket has one dramatic consequence on the cohomology. As it has been shown in [6], the classical BRST cohomology is not given by the longitudinal cohomology along the gauge orbits, as in the standard case. It is rather given by the longitudinal cohomology tensored by the ghosts η^α of the second class constraints, which are associated with no gauge direction but which are not removed in cohomology. In the regular case with invertible Poisson bracket, first class constraints play a dual role. Not only do they constrain the system, but also, they generate the gauge transformations. This dual role is lost when the bracket is degenerate, since the (original) second class constraints appear as first class but generate no gauge transformation. They actually generate nothing at all because of (1). The disappearance of the dual role played by the constraints makes previous analyses of the BRST cohomology inapplicable.

To make this point clear, let us consider the simple case of a two-dimensional phase space with coordinates q, p . We take as constraints

$$q = 0, \quad p = 0. \quad (5)$$

This system has no physical degree of freedom and the observables are just the constants since the constraint surface is reduced to a single point. The Dirac bracket is

$$[q, p] = 0. \quad (6)$$

The BRST charge reads

$$\Omega = q\eta^1 + p\eta^2. \quad (7)$$

The gauge orbits are 0-dimensional ($[f, \phi_a] = 0$) so that there is no longitudinal one-form. The exterior longitudinal algebra on the constraint surface reduces to the constants. Yet, the BRST cohomology is given by the polynomials in the ghosts η^a , which cannot be interpreted as longitudinal forms. Indeed, the ghost momenta $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ kill q and p in cohomology, but there is nothing to remove the ghosts. The classical BRST cohomology is thus too large ².

²It is true that the BRST cohomology at ghost number zero is given by the constants. One may argue that this is physically just what is needed. But this feature disappears in the quantum theory, where one finds non trivial operators at ghost number zero (see below).

Let us now turn to the quantum theory. The space of quantum states must provide an irreducible representation of the Dirac brackets. Accordingly, each second class constraint must be realized as the zero operator, as the following argument shows. Each $\hat{\chi}_\alpha$ commutes with everything, so that it is a multiple of the identity. Furthermore, it must have vanishing expectation value for physical states and hence, this multiple of the identity must be zero. As stressed in [3], this is inevitable. Thus, there exist non-vanishing phase space functions that are represented by the operator $\hat{0}$, namely $\chi_\alpha J(z^A)$. This feature enlarges even further the BRST cohomology, by introducing also the ghost momenta $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ in the cohomology. These variables are no longer eliminated by the constraints χ_α , which become quantum-mechanically empty.

In the case of the model (5), the states can be represented as functions of the ghosts, $\psi = \psi(\eta^1, \eta^2)$. The operators are

$$\hat{q}\psi = 0 = \hat{p}\psi, \hat{\eta}^a\psi = \eta^a\psi, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_a\psi = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta^a}\psi. \quad (8)$$

The quantum BRST generator identically vanishes and so any operator $\hat{A}(\hat{\eta}, \hat{\mathcal{P}})$ defines a BRST cohomological class. For instance, $\hat{\eta}^1\hat{\mathcal{P}}_2$ is a ghost number zero BRST invariant operator, but it does not correspond to any of the true physical observables, since these are the multiples of the identity (no physical degree of freedom for the model at hand).

Now, while there is no way to recover the correct cohomology at the classical level by standard means, this is not so at the quantum level. This is because when one passes to quantum mechanics, all the first class constraints recover their characteristic dual role of both constraining the system and generating the gauge transformations, or *of doing neither at all* (but not of doing one and not the other). The operators $\hat{\chi}_\alpha$ corresponding to the original second class constraints do not generate any transformation, as in the classical theory, but they also do not constrain the system anymore since the equations $\hat{\chi}_\alpha = 0$ are of the form $0 = 0$. Hence, one is in the standard setting of the usual Hamiltonian BRST construction, but, of course, in the reducible situation since the constraints $\hat{\chi}_\alpha = 0$ are empty : the second class constraints cease to be irreducible quantum-mechanically. .

As is well known, in order to treat this case, one needs to introduce one pair of conjugate ghosts of ghosts for each second class constraint, even though these constraints are irreducible classically. The correct quantum

BRST charge is given by

$$\hat{\Omega} = \hat{\phi}_a \hat{\eta}^a + \hat{\mathcal{P}}_\alpha \hat{\gamma}^\alpha + \dots \quad (9)$$

where $(\gamma^\alpha, \pi_\alpha)$ are the ghost of ghost conjugate pairs. Once the spectrum includes the ghosts of ghosts, the BRST generator (9) possesses the correct cohomology. Indeed, the main motivation for introducing ghosts of ghosts is precisely based on cohomological considerations [7]. The case of empty constraints is explicitly treated in [2] (chapter 10).

In the case of the above simple model, one has

$$\hat{\Omega} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 \hat{\gamma}^1 + \hat{\mathcal{P}}_2 \hat{\gamma}^2 \quad (10)$$

The ghost of ghost pairs kill the ghost pairs in cohomology and the quantum operator BRST cohomology is correctly given by the multiples of the identity. More precisely, the BRST transformation reads

$$s\eta^1 = \gamma^1, \quad s\gamma^1 = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$s\eta^2 = \gamma^2, \quad s\gamma^2 = 0, \quad (12)$$

$$s\pi_1 = \mathcal{P}_1, \quad s\mathcal{P}_1 = 0, \quad (13)$$

$$s\pi_2 = \mathcal{P}_2, \quad s\mathcal{P}_2 = 0. \quad (14)$$

Hence, the pairs (η^1, γ^1) , (η^2, γ^2) , $(\pi_1, \mathcal{P}_1)$, $(\pi_2, \mathcal{P}_2)$ mutually cancel each other in cohomology.

We thus see that the approach in which one treats all the constraints as first class and uses the Dirac bracket must be supplemented by ghosts of ghosts for the original second class constraints, even if these are irreducible. The ghosts of ghosts can be incorporated by means of the standard techniques. However, this spoils the uniform treatment of the constraints since there are ghosts of ghosts only for the second class constraints and not for the original irreducible first class constraints.

One may try to avoid this problem by modifying the ghosts commutation relations. In this tentative approach, one would replace the ghost Poisson brackets by “Dirac brackets” such that the ghost variables associated with the second class constraints (anti)commute with everything. For instance, for the model (4), one would set

$$[\hat{\eta}^a, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_b] = 0, \quad (15)$$

and one would represent each of the ghost variables as the zero operator in the quantum theory. The space of quantum states would then be one-dimensional and the BRST cohomology would be correct. There would be no need for ghosts of ghosts. However, since this approach requires a separation of the ghosts respectively associated with the first and second class constraints, it fails to provide a uniform treatment of the constraints in the general case.

Alternatively, one may try to keep a uniform treatment of the constraints at the level of the ghosts of ghosts by introducing ghosts of ghosts also for the first class constraints. This is unnecessary since these are irreducible but it can be done if one brings in trivial reducibility conditions among the first class constraints, of the form $0 \text{ times (constraints)} = 0$. These trivial reducibility relations are empty and thus, needs in turn ghosts of ghosts of ghosts at the next level [2, 7]. Since there are empty relations only for the original first class constraints, the procedure spoils again uniformity. One can cure this defect by associating ghosts of ghosts of ghosts also with the original second class constraints. This can be done by introducing again trivial reducibility relations at that level. But this forces one to go on at the next level, and so on, so that a symmetric treatment of all the constraints leads to an infinite tower of ghosts of ghosts. Because of the well known difficulties associated with infinite towers of ghosts of ghosts, the prospects of reaching a manageable uniform treatment of all the constraints are rather grim. This is perhaps not too surprising in view of the very different physical roles played by first class and second class constraints.

Acknowledgements

This work has been supported in part by a grant from the F.N.R.S. and by a research contract with the Commission of the European Communities.

References

- [1] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics*, Belfer Graduate School, Yeshiva University, Academic Press (New York : 1964).
- [2] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems*, Princeton University Press (Princeton : 1992).
- [3] I.A. Batalin and I.V Tyutin, Nucl. Phys. **B381** (1992) 619.
- [4] I.A. Batalin and I.V Tyutin, Phys. Lett. **B302** (1993) 47.
- [5] I.A. Batalin and I.V Tyutin, *Unified Constrained Dynamics*, Lebedev Institute Preprint FIAN/TD/10-93.
- [6] T. Kimura, Commun. Math. Phys. **151** (1993) 155.
- [7] J. Fisch, M. Henneaux, J. Stasheff and C. Teitelboim, Commun. Math. Phys. **120** (1989) 379.